



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,430	09/24/2003	Mikko Makela	915-007.048	5958
4955 7590 01/24/2008 WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			EXAMINER THERIAULT, STEVEN B	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,430

Applicant(s)

MAKELA, MIKKO

Examiner

Steven B. Theriault

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10 and 12-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10, 12-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: RCE filed 11/13/2007.
2. Claims 1, 5-10, 12-49 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, 21, 23, 26, 34, and 40 are the independent claims. Claims 2-4 and 11 have been cancelled and claims 45-49 are new.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/13/2007 has been entered.

Specification

In light of the applicant's amendment to the specification that clarifies the internal memory of the computer to be a computer readable medium, the objection to the specification is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. **Claims 1, 5-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21-28, 30-32, 34-37, 39-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky) U.S. Patent No. 6300947 issued Oct. 9, 2001, in view of Rozenholtz et al. (hereinafter Rozenholtz). U.S. Publication No. 20030030678 filed Aug. 8, 2001.**

In regard to **Independent claim 1**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects-, comprising: combining at least two navigation objects into one combined navigation object, wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects, and wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two graphical navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object, presenting said combined navigation object and presenting said at least two navigation objects if said combined navigation object is selected (Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62 and column 11, lines 25-67). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon (See column 8, lines 44-67 and column 9, lines 30-45 and 14, lines 15-27) after the user has selected a web page or element. Within the page are Hyperlinks that are graphical objects that provide for navigation of content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14). Kanevsky teaches a web page adaptation module 207 that takes web pages and breaks them into parts where the system can determine from the parts how to display the objects in the page on a reduced format screen (See column 9, lines 19-45). Kanevsky teaches a prioritization scheme that uses a variety of rules to present the objects in a reduced form on the display. In figure 14, Kanevsky teaches the prioritization scheme takes two objects of equal priority and reduces their size and combines the objects, after the user has selected the web page containing the objects. The system, as shown in figure 14, reduces the

"my computer icon" and the "globe" icon and present a composite icon. Kanevsky teaches the preferences as to whether the object is manipulated and how include click history, profiles, cookie information, etc, which can include the dependencies related to the object (See column 12, lines 1-15). For example, a dependency can include if I click object 1 then something happens to objects 2, 3 ... so forth. The dependency can be that two or more objects should be displayed together. Kanevsky does not expressly teach the reducing of the icon is performed through scaling. Rozenholtz teaches scaling combined objects into a thumbnail, where pages can be scaled to fit into a thumbnail and sections of the thumbnail can be clicked on to retrieve the represented page (See Para 55-56). Rozenholtz and Kanevsky both teach a process of reducing an image to display it on a smaller device. They both teach combining items into a smaller representation of the image and they both teach the reduction occurs by using priorities or rules. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky and Rozenholtz in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include a specific scaling process to combine the graphical objects when selected through a scaling process. The motivation to combine Rozenholtz with Kanevsky comes from the suggestion in Rozenholtz, to scale elements on a page in accordance with known techniques (See Para 55) for the purpose of displaying selectable elements to a user in a reduced format so that they can determine the relevance of the action they are performing the interface by "clicking on an object" and what type of information will be retrieved in response to the click.

With respect to **dependent claim 5**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said combined navigation object (4-) is presented in a first display mode, and wherein said at least two navigation objects (1-1...1-6) are displayed in a second display mode, if said combined navigation object (4-) is selected (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45 and column 19, lines 42-67). Kanevsky teaches the icons can be in one or more objects are shown in the icon. The icon can be shown in the mode where the user's history deems where and when the icon is displayed (first mode).

Another interpretation of Kanevsky teaches that the Icons can be combined and shown in a web page. The user can select one part of the Icon and then the second part is shown in a reduced state or as and ICON with the selected information displayed (Second mode).

With respect to **dependent claim 6**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein each of said at least two navigation objects (~~1-1..1-6~~) is associated with one respective target object that is displayed or executed upon selection of said respective navigation objects (~~1-1..1-6~~) (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45).

With respect to **dependent claim 7**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said respective target object that is displayed or executed upon selection of said respective navigation objects (~~1-11-6~~) is displayed or executed in said first display mode (See column 15, lines 35-61).

With respect to **dependent claim 8**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said navigation objects (~~1-1..1-6~~) are defined according to a markup language, in particular the Hypertext Markup Language (~~HTML~~) or derivatives thereof, and are interpreted by a browser (See column 6, lines 10-20).

With respect to **dependent claim 9**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said at least two navigation objects (~~1-1..1-6~~) are hyperlinks (See column 10, lines 5-16).

With respect to **dependent claim 10**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein said first display mode is a scaled format display mode, and wherein said second display mode is an un-scaled format display mode (See column 16, lines 60-67 and column 11, lines 25-45 and column 19, lines 42-67 and column 6, lines 52-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 12**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein in said first display mode, a first display window is used, and wherein in said second display mode, a second display window (~~8~~) is used (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45).

With respect to **dependent claim 13**, Kanevsky teaches the method wherein both said first and second display mode are used in the same display window (Kanevsky column 11, lines 25-45).

and figures 11, 12 and 14).

With respect to **dependent claim 14**, Kanevsky teaches the method herein in said second display mode, at least one of a horizontal and a vertical scroll bar (~~7~~) is provided (Kanevsky column 16, lines 25-30).

With respect to **dependent claim 15**, Kanevsky teaches the method further comprising ~~the step of determining whether said at least two navigation objects (1-1-1-6) have to be combined into one combined navigation object (4) or not~~ (See column 8, lines 43-67).

In regard to claims **17, 25, 18 -19**, claims 17, 25, 18 -19 reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 1, 5, and 15, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims **21-22**, claims 21-22 reflect the device comprising computer executable instruction used for performing the method steps as claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. Kanevsky expressly teaches the invention is utilized in a web environment which would include a browser (See figure 1, 101) and the computer readable medium to execute the steps of claim 1 (See figure 2).

In regard to claims **23, 31-32**, claims 23, 31-32 reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 26-28, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

With respect to **dependent claim 24**, as indicated in the above discussion, Kanevsky in view of Rozenholtz teaches every limitation of claim 1.

Kanevsky does not expressly teaches the method wherein said at least two graphical navigation objects if said combined navigational object is selected presenting said navigational objects in an un-scaled format

Kanevsky teaches combining an object when it is determined that a browser page is too large to be displayed on a small screen(See column 2, lines 45-55 and column 8, lines 50-67 and column 9, lines 30-65). Kanevsky teaches that if the larger screen were to be used then items can be added to the page. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Rozenholtz, because Rozenholtz teaches that after selection the elements can be displayed in a variety of size including full size (See Para 104 and Figure 20 and 22) as some elements can be displayed in a document full size and some reduced size (See Para 123). It is important to note that the selectable elements within Rozenholtz are within a webpage. In figure 22, there are sections of the page that are text and others navigational elements, both are selectable. The user can select on one item that is un-scaled or displayed in full size and the system would navigate to the relevant material. The item can be a combination element and scaling may not be necessary (See Para 94).

In regard to **Independent claim 26**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects, comprising: combining at least two navigation objects into one combined navigation object, wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects, wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two graphical navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object, and wherein said combined navigation object is presentable and selectable to trigger presentation of said at least two navigation objects(Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon(See column 8, lines 44-67 and column 9, lines 30-45 and 14, lines 15-27). Hyperlinks are graphical objects that provide for navigation of content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14). Kanevsky teaches a web page adaptation module 207 that takes web pages and breaks them into parts where the system can determine from the parts how to display the objects in the page on a reduced format screen (See column 9, lines 19-45).

Kanevsky teaches a prioritization scheme that uses a variety of rules to present the objects in a reduced form on the display. In figure 14, Kanevsky teaches the prioritization scheme takes two objects of equal priority and reduces their size and combines the objects, after the user has selected the web page containing the objects. The system, as shown in figure 14, reduces the "my computer icon" and the globe and present a composite icon. Kanevsky teaches the preferences as to whether the object is manipulated and how include click history, profiles, cookie information, etc, which can include the dependencies related to the object (See column 12, lines 1-15). For example, a dependency can include if I click object 1 then something happens to objects 2, 3, ... so forth. The dependency can be that two or more objects should be displayed together. Kanevsky does not expressly teach the reducing of the Icon is performed through scaling. Rozenholtz teaches scaling combined objects into a thumbnail, where pages can be scaled to fit into a thumbnail and sections of the thumbnail can be clicked on to retrieve the represented page (See Para 55-56). Rozenholtz and Kanevsky both teach a process of reducing an image to display it on a smaller device. They both teach combining items into a smaller representation of the image and they both teach the reduction occurs by using priorities or rules. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky and Rozenholtz in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include a specific scaling process to combine the graphical objects when selected through a scaling process. The motivation to combine Rozenholtz with Kanevsky comes from the suggestion in Rozenholtz, to scale elements on a page in accordance with known techniques (See Para 55) for the purpose of displaying selectable elements to a user in a reduced format so that they can determine the relevance of the action they are performing the interface by "clicking on an object" and what type of information will be retrieved in response to the click.

With respect to **dependent claim 27**, as indicated in the above discussion, Kanevsky in view of Rozenholtz teaches every limitation of claim 26

Kanevsky does not expressly teach the method wherein said at least two graphical navigation objects is in an un-scaled format. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Rozenholtz, because Rozenholtz teaches that after selection the elements can be displayed in a variety of size including full size (See Para 104 and Figure 20 and 22) as some elements can be displayed in a document full size and some reduced size (See Para 123). It is important to note that the selectable elements within Rozenholtz are within a webpage. In figure 22, there are sections of the page that are text and others navigational elements, both are selectable. The user can select on one item that is un-scaled or displayed in full size and the system would navigate to the relevant material. The item can be a combination element and scaling may not be necessary (See Para 94).

With respect to **dependent claim 28**, Kanevsky teaches the method further comprising determining whether said at least two navigation objects have to be combined into one combined navigation object or not, wherein said determining is performed by a device (See column 8, lines 35-67 and column 7, line 40-55).

With respect to **dependent claim 30**, Kanevsky teaches the computer-readable medium having a computer program stored thereon, the computer program comprising instructions operable to cause a processor to perform the method of claim 26 (See Figure 2 and column 5, lines 20-50).

In regard to **Independent claim 34**, Kanevsky teaches a method for improved portrayal of navigation objects, comprising: receiving a combined navigation object obtained by combining at least two navigation objects into one combined navigation object, wherein said at least two navigation objects are graphical objects, and wherein said combining comprises merging said at least two graphical navigation objects into a combined graphical navigation object by scaling,

presenting said combined navigation object, and presenting said at least two navigation objects, if said combined navigation object is selected (Kanevsky column 2, lines 20-45 and column 15, lines 35-61 and column 19, lines 26-62). Kanevsky teaches a process of combining hyperlinks from a webpage into a composite icon(See column 8, lines 44-67 and column 9, lines 30-45 and 14, lines 15-27). Hyperlinks are graphical objects that provide for navigation of content. Kanevsky teaches the combined object is presented when it is selected by the user (See figure 11, 12 and 14). Kanevsky teaches a web page adaptation module 207 that takes web pages and breaks them into parts where the system can determine from the parts how to display the objects in the page on a reduced format screen (See column 9, lines 19-45). Kanevsky teaches a prioritization scheme that uses a variety of rules to present the objects in a reduced form on the display. In figure 14, Kanevsky teaches the prioritization scheme takes two objects of equal priority and reduces their size and combines the objects, after the user has selected the web page containing the objects. The system, as shown in figure 14, reduces the "my computer icon" and the globe and present a composite icon. Kanevsky teaches the preferences as to whether the object is manipulated and how include click history, profiles, cookie information, etc, which can include the dependencies related to the object (See column 12, lines 1-15). For example, a dependency can include if I click object 1 then something happens to objects 2, 3, ... so forth. The dependency can be that two or more objects should be displayed together. Kanevsky does not expressly teach the reducing of the Icon is performed through scaling. Rozenholtz teaches scaling combined objects into a thumbnail, where pages can be scaled to fit into a thumbnail and sections of the thumbnail can be clicked on to retrieve the represented page (See Para 55-56). Rozenholtz and Kanevsky both teach a process of reducing an image to display it on a smaller device. They both teach combining items into a smaller representation of the image and they both teach the reduction occurs by using priorities or rules.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky and Rozenholtz in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include a specific scaling process to combine the graphical objects when

selected through a scaling process. The motivation to combine Rozenholtz with Kanevsky comes from the suggestion in Rozenholtz, to scale elements on a page in accordance with known techniques (See Para 55) for the purpose of displaying selectable elements to a user in a reduced format so that they can determine the relevance of the action they are performing the interface by "clicking on an object" and what type of information will be retrieved in response to the click.

With respect to **dependent claim 35**, as indicated in the above discussion, Kanevsky in view of Rozenholtz teaches every limitation of claim 34.

Kanevsky does not expressly teach a method wherein said at least two graphical navigation objects if said navigation object is selected comprises presenting said navigation objects in an un-scaled format. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Rozenholtz, because Rozenholtz teaches that after selection the elements can be displayed in a variety of size including full size (See Para 104 and Figure 20 and 22) as some elements can be displayed in a document full size and some reduced size (See Para 123). It is important to note that the selectable elements within Rozenholtz are within a webpage. In figure 22, there are sections of the page that are text and others navigational elements, both are selectable. The user can select on one item that is un-scaled or displayed in full size and the system would navigate to the relevant material. The item can be a combination element and scaling may not be necessary (See Para 94).

With respect to **dependent claim 36**, Kanevsky teaches method wherein said combined navigation object is presented in a first display mode, and wherein said at least two navigation objects are presented in a second display mode, if said combined navigation object is selected (See column 6, lines 50-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 37**, Kanevsky teaches method wherein said first display mode is a scaled format display mode, and wherein said second display mode is an un-scaled format

display mode (See column 16, lines 60-67 and column 11, lines 25-45 and column 19, lines 42-67 and column 6, lines 52-65).

With respect to **dependent claim 39**, Kanevsky teaches a computer-readable medium having a computer program stored thereon, the computer program comprising instructions operable to cause a processor to perform the method of claim 34 (See figure 2 and column 5, lines 20-50).

In regard to claims **40-43**, claims 40-43 reflect the device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claims 34-37, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

With respect to **dependent claims 45-49**, as indicated in the above discussion, Kanevsky in view of Rozenholtz teaches every limitation of claims 18, 23, 26, 46, and 48.

Kanevsky does not expressly teach wherein the first display mode is a scaled format mode and where the second display mode is an un-scaled format display mode and wherein the combined navigation object is presentable in a first mode and wherein at least two navigation objects are presented in a second display mode, if said combined object is selected. However, these limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Rozenholtz, because Rozenholtz teaches several display formats for combinational elements on a thumbnail (See figures 19-28) where the first mode can be Figure 28, scaled mode and the combinational elements can be displayed in an un-scaled format (see figures 19-22) (See also Para 0094). Rozenholtz also teaches the morphing can be performed through a series of visual effects or animation that can include displaying objects in a variety of formats (See Para 0108).

6. **Claims 16, 20, 29, 33, 38 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter Kanevsky) U.S. Patent No. 6300947 issued Oct. 9, 2001, in view of Rozenholtz et al. (hereinafter Rozenholtz). U.S. Publication No. 20030030678 filed Aug. 8, 2001, in further view of Carroll et al. (hereinafter Carroll) U.S. Patent No. 6154205 issued Nov. 28, 2000.**

With respect to **dependent claims 16, 20, 29, 33, 38 and 44**, as indicated in the above discussion Kanevsky in view of Rozenholtz teaches each limitation of claims 1, 17, 23, 26, 34 and 40.

Kanevsky teaches the process of combining two navigational objects and adapting the objects and displaying them in several states (See column 2, lines 45-55 and column 8, lines 50-67 and column 9, lines 30-65). Rozenholtz expressly teaches scaling objects that are combined into a thumbnail through the process of scaling. The thumbnail can be large enough to display items at full size as the thumbnail represents entire pages of elements or multiple pages.

Kanevsky in view of Rozenholtz does not expressly teach the method wherein said at least two navigation objects are image hyperlinks within an image map contained in a web page, wherein said combined navigation object is represented by a selectable scaled graphical representation of said image map and wherein said image hyperlinks within said image map are displayed in un-scaled format, if said selectable graphical representation is selected.

However, in the same problem solving area Carroll teaches a system of displaying at least two navigational objects that are image hyperlinks in an image map within a web page for the purposes of making it easier for a user to select and navigate through web based content and to select objects on the screen (See column 1, lines 30-50 and column 2, lines 35-42). Carroll also teaches a process where the document may be larger than the display area, which is analogous to the situation in Kanevsky. Finally, Carroll teaches the hyperlink can be virtually any type of object, which would include a combined object (See column 3, lines 55-63). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Kanevsky, Rozenholtz and Carroll in front of them, to modify the system of Kanevsky to include an image map within the web page. The motivation to combine Kanevsky, Rozenholtz with Carroll comes from the suggestion in Carroll that any type of object can be displayed as an icon (See column 3, lines 55-63 and column 6, lines 20-35) and that client side processing can include providing client side image maps contain selectable objects that are associated with hyperlinks, much like the associations made in Kanevsky.

It is noted that any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-10, 12-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, applicant has addressed specific arguments that the Examiner will address.

Applicant's argument regarding the Examiner disregards the "If"

The applicant argues that the Examiner has missed the "if" limitation where the combined graphical element is displayed "if" the user has selected the combined object (See arguments page 13).

The Examiner disagrees.

The Examiner did not disregard the "if" in the claim, as the Examiner interprets the **entire** teachings of Kanevsky, not just the cited sections, that are of the same embodiment where a given page is adapted after the user selects a link to see the given page, which would lead a given object based on a given priority to be adapted as shown in figure 14. Kanevsky teaches adapting a page to display items together (See column 2, lines 20-45) and the Examiners


interpretation of the claim states presenting the navigational object if the combined object is selected. Therefore, the (1123) link can be presented if selected by the user, while it is on a page adapted by the system of Kanevsky. Moreover, the Examiner has changed the rejection to include Rozenholtz to teach the scaling process and therefore, the Examiner believes the interpretation provided by the applicant is moot based on the new art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


/Steven B. Theriault/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2179